arXiv:quant-ph/0611083v3 7 Mar 2008

Explicit form of correlation function three-settings tight Bell inequalities for three qubits

Marcin Wieśniak,[1] Piotr Badziąg,[2, 1] and Marek Żukowski[1, 2]

[1] Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, PL-80-952 Gdańsk
[2]Alba Nova Fysikum, University of Stockholm, SŬ106 91, Sweden

We present a method to derive explicit forms of tight correlation function Bell inequalities for three systems and dichotomic observables, which involve three settings for each observer. We also give sufficient and necessary conditions for quantum predictions to satisfy the new inequalities.

PACS numbers:

INTRODUCTION

The problem of the possibility of a local realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics was first addressed in the discussion between Einstein, Podolsky, Rosen [1] and Bohr [2]. The final answer was provided in 1964 by Bell [3]. The paper of Bell contains an inequality for local realistic (LR) correlation functions, which can be violated only by non-classical, entangled states. The correlation function is defined as a mean value of a product of local observables. For example, a two-qubit correlation function shall be given by $E_{ij} = \langle A_i B_j \rangle$, with A_i being an ith observable for the first observer (Alice) and B_j is jth for the second (Bob). The observables are dichotomic, with eigenvalues ± 1. In the work of Clauser, Horne, Shimony, and Holt (CHSH) [4] a new inequality was derived, which, in contradistinction to the original Bell's expression, can be applied to real physical processes.[21] Again, it was formulated for LR correlation functions. Such formulations of the Bell inequalities are now the most popular forms of it. The discovery of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger correlations triggered generalizations of Bell inequalities to more subsystems [5]. The early efforts in this direction were restricted to the scenarios involving two experimental settings per observer only. The full set of such inequalities was finally given in Refs. [6, 7]. More recently, however, maps between general Bell inequalities for correlation functions (even yet unknown ones) and quantum cryptography [8], as well as quantum communication complexity problems [9], have been found. Thus, there is an additional motivation to find new *tight* Bell inequalities of this kind, with the obvious direction of generalization toward more allowed settings for each observer. Allowing more settings leads e.g. to more complicated communication complexity problems, and from the fundamental point of view, must further restrict the realm of classically admissible correlations.

By tight Bell inequalities one understands these, which define walls of a polytope in a certain statistical hyperspace, which in turn defines the full set of possible local-realistic predictions for the values of correlation functions for the given set of Bell-type experiments. The vertices of the polytope are deterministic predictions, that is, are given by extremal correlation functions for which the product of the values for the each pair of measurement directions are always the same. Thus vertices have components equal to ± 1. The polytope was initially proposed for the probability hyperspace [10]. Various aspects of the problem were subsequently discussed by a number of authors, for example in [11, 12, 13]. More recently, a method to derive the general structure of coefficients of tight Bell inequalities for correlation functions, which involve three, or more, settings available to each observer, was presented in [14]. Here, basing on the results of [14] we develop this method with the aim of getting the *explicit* form of the inequalities for three observers. This is the simplest case for which tight three-setting Bell inequalities are thus far unknown.

THREE QUBIT INEQUALITIES

Let us consider a situation, in which each of the three observers can choose between three measurements. For three systems (observed by Alice, Bob and Carol independently) and dichotomic observables, the tight Bell inequalities have a general form of [14]

$$-1 \le \frac{1}{2^9}\sum_{a_i,b_j,c_k=\pm 1} S(a_0,a_1,a_2;b_0,b_1,b_2;c_0,c_1,c_2) \times \left(\sum_{i,j,k=0}^{2} a_i b_j c_k E_{ijk}\right) \le 1. \qquad (1)$$

where E_{ijk} is the value of the local realistic correlation function (i.e. the average of the product of the local results, which in turn are assumed to be ± 1) for settings i, j, k of A, B, and C. $S(...)$ is a sign function (values ± 1), of the nine parameters, $a_0, ..., c_2$. An admissible sign function has the form of [14]

$$\begin{gathered} S(a_0, a_1, a_2; b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) \\ = \textstyle\sum_{i,j,k=0}^{2} g_{ijk} a_i b_j c_k = \pm 1. \end{gathered} \tag{2}$$

This relation can be inverted to give

$$g_{ijk} = \frac{1}{2^9} \sum_{a_i, b_j, c_k = \pm 1} S(a_0, a_1, a_2; b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) a_i b_j c_k. \tag{3}$$

This allows rewriting (1) as:

$$\left| \sum_{i,j,k=0}^{2} g_{ijk} E_{ijk} \right| \leq 1, \tag{4}$$

where $E_{ijk} = \langle A_i B_j C_k \rangle$.

Note also that the form of the sign functions, as in equation (2), restricts the admissible class which generates the inequalities. The elementary trait of the class is that the admissible sign functions do not depend upon product of indices pertaining to one observer, e.g. $a_1 a_2$, etc. Note also, that one can reduce the number of considered inequalities to those involving sign functions with $a_0 = 1$, and in such a case the normalization factor changes from $\frac{1}{2^9}$ to $\frac{1}{2^6}$. This convention was used in ref. [14]. However, it turns out that the more symmetric convention is handier for pinpointing the exact form of the coefficients, and thus we shall adopt it here.

PROPERTIES OF THE COEFFICIENTS IN THE INEQUALITIES

To derive explicit Bell expressions it is convenient to define the following quantities, which we will further on call deltas. The first order deltas:

$$\Delta_x = \frac{1}{2}(S(x = 1) - S(x = -1)), \tag{5}$$

the second order deltas:

$$\Delta_{xy} = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_x(y = 1) - \Delta_x(y = -1)), \tag{6}$$

and the third order deltas:

$$\Delta_{xyz} = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_{xy}(z = 1) - \Delta_{xy}(z = -1)). \tag{7}$$

Each of the indices x, y, z is related to a different party, e. g. $x = a_0, a_1, a_2; y = b_0, b_1, b_2; z = c_0, c_1, c_2$.

The third order deltas are equal to the coefficients g_{jkl}. We can create the second order deltas from them in the following way:

$$\Delta_{a_0 b_0}(c_0, c_1, c_2) = c_0 \Delta_{a_0 b_0 c_0} + c_1 \Delta_{a_0 b_0 c_1} + c_2 \Delta_{a_0 b_0 c_2} = c_0 g_{000} + c_1 g_{001} + c_1 g_{002}, \tag{8}$$

and likewise for the remaining $\Delta_{a_i b_j}$'s. Likewise,

$$\Delta_{a_0}(b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) = b_0 \Delta_{a_0 b_0}(c_0, c_1, c_2) + b_1 \Delta_{a_0 b_1}(c_0, c_1, c_2) + b_2 \Delta_{a_0 b_2}(c_0, c_1, c_2), \tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{gathered} S(a_0, a_1, a_2; b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) \\ = a_0 \Delta_{a_0}(b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) + a_1 \Delta_{a_1}(b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) + a_2 \Delta_{a_2}(b_0, b_1, b_2; c_0, c_1, c_2) \quad , \end{gathered} \tag{10}$$

etc..

Properties of the deltas

As $S = \pm 1$, each of the first order deltas Δ_{a_i} can be equal to ± 1 (S changes with a_i) or 0 (S does not change with a_i). From the possible values of the first order deltas we can deduce, that a second order delta can only be 0 (no change), $\pm\frac{1}{2}$ (a change of Δ_{a_i} with a_i from 0 to ± 1, or vice versa), or ± 1 (a change between 1 and -1). By the same argument the coefficients g_{ijk} may assume values $0, \pm\frac{1}{4}, \pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{3}{4}$ or ± 1.

Finally, one can easily see that the coefficients g_{ijk} satisfy the following relation

$$\left|\sum_{j,k,l=0}^{2} g_{jkl}\right| = \sum_{j,k,l=0}^{2} g_{jkl}^2 = 1.$$

The first condition is due to a fact that the inequalities we are searching for are saturated for all deterministic LR models, the second is related to Parseval's theorem: for every sign function of nine dichotomic variables we have $\sum_{a_i,b_j,c_k=\pm 1} S^2 = 512$.

The last inequality immediately implies that when one of coefficients g_{ijk} has modulus 1, then all the others must be 0. In such a case, we get a family of trivial inequalities $|E_{ijk}| \leq 1$.

Construction of sign functions

Each second order delta can contain one, two, or three coefficients g_{ijk}, and, similarly, the first order deltas contain up to three second order deltas. Not every pair or triplet of the second order deltas can be arranged into higher-order deltas, however. The following table lists the families of $\Delta_{a_ib_j}$'s, and what other $\Delta_{a_ib_j}$'s they can go with to create a valid Δ_{a_i} (we avoid repetitions in the table):

$\Delta_{a_ib_j}$	goes with:
$\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m 3c_x + (-1)^n c_y)$	$\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y)$
$\frac{1}{4}(2(-1)^m c_x + (-1)^n c_y + (1)^o c_z)$	$\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y)$ or $\pm\frac{1}{4}(2(-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y - (-1)^o c_z)$ or $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y)$ and $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^o c_z)$
$\frac{1}{2}((-1)^m c_x + (-1)^n c_y)$	alone or with $\frac{1}{2}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y)$ or two $\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y)$'s
$\frac{1}{2}(-1)^m c_x$	any one of $\pm\frac{1}{2}c_x, \pm\frac{1}{2}c_y, \pm\frac{1}{2}c_z$ or $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x + (-1)^n c_y)$ and $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x - (-1)^n c_y)$ or $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^n c_y + (-1)^o c_z)$ and $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^n c_y - (-1)^o c_z)$
$\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x + (-1)^n c_y)$	$\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x + (-1)^n c_y)$ or $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^n c_y - (-1)^o c_z)$ and $\pm\frac{1}{4}((-1)^m c_x + (-1)^o c_z)$

In the table (x, y, z) stand for a permutations of $(0, 1, 2)$, while $m, n, o \in \{0, 1\}$.

Thus any first order delta belongs (after some transformations, i. e. permutations of observables, or sign flips) to one of the families listed below:

	Δ_{a_i}	$\lvert\Delta_{a_i}\rvert^2$		Δ_{a_i}	$\lvert\Delta_{a_i}\rvert^2$
Δ_0	$\frac{1}{2}(b_0(c_0 + c_1) + b_1(c_0 - c_1))$	$\frac{16}{16}$	Δ_I	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0(-3c_0 + c_1) + b_1(c_0 + c_1))$	$\frac{12}{16}$
Δ_{II}	$\frac{1}{2}b_0(c_0 + c_1)$	$\frac{8}{16}$	Δ_{III}	$\frac{1}{2}(b_0 + b_1)c_0$	$\frac{8}{16}$
Δ_{IV}	$\frac{1}{2}(b_0c_0 + b_1c_1)$	$\frac{8}{16}$	Δ_V	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0(2c_0 + c_1 + c_2) + b_1(c_1 - c_2))$	$\frac{8}{16}$
Δ_{VI}	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0 + b_1)(c_0 + c_1)$	$\frac{4}{16}$	Δ_{VII}	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0(c_1 - c_2) + b_1(c_0 - c_1) + b_2(c_0 - c_2))$	$\frac{6}{16}$
Δ_{VIII}	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0(2c_0 + c_1 + c_2) + b_1(c_0 - c_1) + b_2(c_0 - c_2))$	$\frac{10}{16}$	Δ_{IX}	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0(2c_0 + c_1 + c_2) + b_1(2c_0 - c_1 - c_2))$	$\frac{12}{16}$
Δ_X	$\frac{1}{4}(b_0(2c_0 + 2c_1) + (b_1 + b_2)(c_0 - c_1))$	$\frac{12}{16}$	Δ_{XI}	$\frac{1}{4}(2b_0 + b_1(c_0 + c_1) + b_2(c_0 - c_1)$	$\frac{8}{16}$
Δ_{XII}	$\frac{1}{4}(2b_0c_0 + b_1(c_1 + c_2) + b_2(c_1 - c_2))$	$\frac{8}{16}$			

The norm $|\Delta_{a_i}|^2$ is the sum of squares of those g_{ijk} coefficients, which enter a given delta. As it has been already mentioned before, in an admissible sign function these norms add up to 1 [20]. However, this is only a necessary condition to build an inequality. The necessary and sufficient condition is that $\sum_{i=0}^{2} |\Delta_{a_i}|^2 = 1$ and $\Delta_{a_i}\Delta_{a_{i'}} = 0$ for $i \neq i'$. Only a few pairs or triplets of these deltas lead us to a proper Bell expression.

TWO QUBITS

As an illustration of the method we will consider the two qubit case first.

For two systems (observed by Alice and Bob), the tight Bell inequalities have a general form of [14]

$$-1 \leq \tfrac{1}{2^6}\sum_{a_i,b_j=\pm1} S(a_0,a_1,a_2;b_0,b_1,b_2)\left(\sum_{i,j=0}^{2} a_i b_j E_{ij}\right) \leq 1. \tag{11}$$

where $E_{ij} = \langle A_i B_j\rangle$ is the value of the correlation function for the ith and jth setting of Alice and Bob, respectively. $S(...)$ is the sign function of $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2$. The coefficients g_{ij}'s of this function are related to S by [14]:

$$S(a_0,a_1,a_2;b_0,b_1,b_2) = \sum_{i,j=0}^{2} g_{ij} a_i b_j = \pm 1. \tag{12}$$

Thus

$$g_{ij} = \frac{1}{2^6}\sum_{a_i,b_j=\pm1} S(a_0,a_1,a_2;b_0,b_1,b_2) a_i b_j. \tag{13}$$

This allows to rewrite (11) as

$$\left|\sum_{i,j=0}^{2} g_{ij} E_{ij}\right| \leq 1. \tag{14}$$

It is enough to define first and second order deltas. The second order deltas are equivalent to g_{ij}'s. As we have mentioned, the first order deltas can only take values of 0 or ±1 and $g_{ij} = 0, \pm\frac{1}{2}$, or ±1. If some Δ_{a_i} is always equal to ±1, the sign function is factorisable, and generates a trivial bound:

$$|E_{ij}| \leq 1. \tag{15}$$

If some Δ_{a_i} takes all three values (±1 and 0), it can be locally transformed to $\frac{1}{2}(b_0 + b_1)$. The other Δ_{a_i} vanishes when the first one does not, and vice versa, so it can be taken as $\frac{1}{2}(b_0 - b_1)$. Thus we reproduce the CHSH inequality [4]:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left|E_{00} + E_{01} + E_{10} - E_{11}\right| \leq 1. \tag{16}$$

No other inequalities of this kind for two qubits are allowed, because we have utilized all possible values of g_{ij}'s and all possible forms of Δ_{a_i}'s.

As we see the set of Bell inequalities for correlation functions, for two partner and three settings on each side, boils down to the good old CHSH inequalities, for all possible combinations of pairs of settings. This result corroborates with the earlier finding of Garg [15].

THREE-QUBIT INEQUALITIES

Since the method is universal, it produces both the well-known standard Bell inequalities [6, 7], which are shown in the first subsection below, and the new ones, which are the subject of the second subsection.

$2 \times 2 \times 2$ inequalities

- Using Δ_I and Δ_{IV} we can obtain the following sign function:

$$S = \tfrac{1}{4}(a_0(b_0(-3c_0 + c_1) + b_1(c_0 + c_1)) + a_1(b_0 + b_1)(c_0 + c_1)), \tag{17}$$

  and by putting it into (3), we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{4}\left| -3E_{000} + E_{001} + E_{010} + E_{011} + E_{100} + E_{101} + E_{110} + E_{111}\right| \leq 1. \tag{18}$$

- Taking two Δ_{II}'s or two Δ_{III}'s we get
  $$S = \tfrac{1}{2}(a_0 b_0 (c_0 + c_1) + a_1 b_0 (c_0 - c_1)). \tag{19}$$
  This leads to the inequality, which is a trivial extension of the CHSH one:
  $$\frac{1}{2}|E_{000} + E_{001} + E_{100} - E_{101}| \leq 1, \tag{20}$$
  With two Δ_{II}'s or two Δ_{III}'s one can also get
  $$S = \tfrac{1}{2}(a_0 (b_0 + b_1) c_0 + a_1 (b_0 - b_1) c_0), \tag{21}$$
  this gives
  $$\frac{1}{2}|E_{000} + E_{010} + E_{100} - E_{110}| \leq 1. \tag{22}$$
- and
  $$S \ = \ \frac{1}{2}(a_0 b_0 (c_0 + c_1) + a_1 b_1 (c_0 - c_1)), \tag{23}$$
  this in turn implies
  $$\frac{1}{2}|E_{000} + E_{001} + E_{110} - E_{111}| \leq 1. \tag{24}$$
- Finally, a combination of Δ_{II} and Δ_{III} leads to
  $$S \ = \ \frac{1}{2}(a_0 (b_0 c_0 + b_1 c_1) + a_1 (b_1 c_0 - b_0 c_1)). \tag{25}$$
  It results in a Mermin-Ardehali-Belinskii-Klyshko inequality [16]:
  $$\frac{1}{2}|E_{000} + E_{011} + E_{101} - E_{110}| \leq 1. \tag{26}$$

This closes the group of possible inequalities which involve only two settings (out of the three ones allowed in the considered scenario).

Inequalities with up to three measurement settings per observer

However, our method can also lead to thus far unknown inequalities. The most important is one in which all three observers perform three alternative measurements. The sign function is built of Δ_V and two Δ_{VII}'s:

$$\begin{aligned} S = \tfrac{1}{4}(&a_0(b_1(c_1 - c_2) + b_2(c_1 - c_2)) + a_1(b_0(c_1 + c_2) + b_1(c_0 + c_1) + b_2(-c_0 + c_2)) \\ &+ a_2(b_0(-c_1 - c_2) + b_1(c_0 + c_2) + b_2(-c_0 + c_1))). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

It represents the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{1}{4}|E_{011} - E_{012} + E_{021} - E_{022} + E_{101} + E_{102} + E_{110} + E_{111} \\ &-E_{120} + E_{122} - E_{201} - E_{202} + E_{210} + E_{211} - E_{220} + E_{221}| \ \leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

From this inequality follow two other, less general conditions. Putting $a_0 = a_2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} S = \tfrac{1}{4}(&-a_0(b_0(c_1 + c_2) - b_1(c_0 + c_1) + b_2(c_0 - 2c_1 + c2) \\ &+ a_1(b_0(c_1 + c_2) + b_1(c_0 + c_1) + b_2(-c_0 + c_2))), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

this represents

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{1}{4}| - E_{001} - E_{002} + E_{010} + E_{011} - E_{020} + 2E_{021} \\ &+ E_{022} + E_{101} + E_{102} + E_{110} + E_{111} - E_{120} + E_{222}| \leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

If we rather put $a_2 = a_1$ we have

$$S = \tfrac{1}{4}(a_0(b_1(c_1 - c_2) + b_2(c_1 - c_2) \\ + a_1(b_1(2c_0 + c_1 + c_2) + b_2(2c_0 - c_1 - c_2))), \tag{31}$$

this gives

$$\tfrac{1}{4}|E_{011} - E_{012} + E_{021} - E_{022} + 2E_{110} \\ + E_{111} + E_{112} + 2E_{120} - E_{121} - E_{122}| \leq 1. \tag{32}$$

Our method leads to yet another Bell inequality. Two Δ_{XII}'s can be arranged to

$$S = \tfrac{1}{4}(a_0(2b_0c_0 + b_1(c_1 + c_2) + b_2(c_1 - c_2)) \\ + a_1(2b_0c_0 - b_1(c_1 + c_2) - b_2(c_1 - c_2))), \tag{33}$$

what represents

$$\tfrac{1}{4}|2E_{000} + E_{011} + E_{012} + E_{021} - E_{022} \\ + 2E_{100} - E_{111} - E_{112} - E_{121} + E_{122}| \leq 1. \tag{34}$$

Interestingly, inequalities (30), (32), and (34) are special cases of the one given in [17, 18],

$$\tfrac{1}{4}|E_{000} + E_{001} + E_{010} - E_{011} \\ + E_{022} + E_{023} + E_{032} - E_{033} \\ + E_{100} + E_{101} + E_{110} - E_{111} \\ - E_{122} - E_{123} - E_{132} + E_{133} \leq 1. \tag{35}$$

Inequality (34) is obtained by putting $\hat{C}_0 = \hat{C}_1$. Then we can get (32) by $\hat{B}_0 = \hat{B}_2$. Finally, choosing $\hat{B}_0 = \hat{B}_2$ and $\hat{C}_0 = \hat{C}_2$ from (35) we reach (30) Further such simplifications lead to the standard 2 × 2 × 2 inequalities.

CONDITIONS ON STATE TO SATISFY THE NEW INEQUALITIES

In this Section we will derive sufficient conditions which a state must satisfy in order to never violate the Bell inequality. Such conditions are not dependent on particular measurement settings, but refer only to the properties of the state.

As inequalities (30) and (32) are special cases of (28), we focus only on the conditions for (28) and (34).

Let us recall that any observable on a qubit with spectrum $\{-1, 1\}$ can be written as $\hat{X}_i = \vec{X}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}^X$ ($X = A, B, C$; $i = 0, 1, 2$, the upper index of the Pauli matrix vector enumerates the qubit and all the vectors are normalized). In terms of the correlation tensor (elements of which are given by $T_{ijk} = Tr\rho(\sigma_i^A \otimes \sigma_j^B \otimes \sigma_k^C)$) inequality (28) can be written as

$$\tfrac{1}{4}\Big|\hat{T} \odot \Big(\vec{A}_0 \otimes (\vec{B}_1 + \vec{B}_2)(\vec{C}_1 - \vec{C}_2) \\ + (\vec{A}_1 - \vec{A}_2) \otimes \vec{B}_0 \otimes (\vec{C}_1 + \vec{C}_2) \\ + (\vec{A}_1 + \vec{A}_2) \otimes (\vec{B}_1 + \vec{B}_2) \otimes \vec{C}_0 \\ + \tfrac{1}{2}(\vec{A}_1 + \vec{A}_2) \otimes (\vec{B}_1 + \vec{B}_2) \otimes (\vec{C}_1 + \vec{C}_2) \\ + \tfrac{1}{2}(\vec{A}_1 - \vec{A}_2) \otimes (\vec{B}_1 - \vec{B}_2) \otimes (\vec{C}_1 - \vec{C}_2)\Big)\Big| \leq 1, \tag{36}$$

where the tensor scalar product is taken as $\hat{A} \odot \hat{B} = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{3} A_{ijk}B_{ijk}$ Note that the tensor in (36) constructed from the vectors defining the measurements contains five mutually orthogonal (in the sense of $\odot$) terms.

We now choose local coordinate systems, in which

$$\vec{A}_1 + \vec{A}_2 = 2\cos\alpha \vec{e}_1, \tag{37}$$

$$\vec{A}_1 - \vec{A}_2 = 2\sin\alpha \vec{e}_2, \tag{38}$$

$$\vec{B}_1 + \vec{B}_2 = 2\cos\beta \vec{e}_1, \tag{39}$$

$$\vec{B}_1 - \vec{B}_2 = 2\sin\beta \vec{e}_2, \tag{40}$$

$$\vec{C}_1 + \vec{C}_2 = 2\cos\gamma \vec{e}_1, \tag{41}$$

$$\vec{C}_1 - \vec{C}_2 = 2\sin\gamma \vec{e}_2, \tag{42}$$

where $\vec{e}_1 = (1,0,0)$, $\vec{e}_2 = (0,1,0)$, and $\vec{e}_3 = (0,0,1)$. Let us moreover introduce a short-hand notation $T_{Aij} = \hat{T} \odot \vec{A}_0 \otimes \vec{e}_i \otimes \vec{e}_j$, $T_{iBj} = \hat{T} \odot \vec{e}_i \otimes \vec{B}_0 \otimes \vec{e}_j$, and $T_{ijC} = \hat{T} \odot \vec{e}_i \otimes \vec{e}_j \otimes \vec{C}_0$. This allows to rewrite (36) in a form of scalar product of two real vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} &|(T_{A12}, T_{2B1}, T_{12C}, T_{111}, T_{222}) \\ &\cdot(\cos\beta\sin\gamma, \sin\alpha\cos\gamma, \cos\alpha\sin\beta, \cos\alpha\cos\beta\cos\gamma, \sin\alpha\sin\beta\sin\gamma)| \leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

This is the necessary and sufficient condition for the given state to satisfy the inequality. That is, if the maximum of the left hand side for all possible local coordinate systems, vectors $\vec{A}_0$, $\vec{B}_0$ and $\vec{C}_0$, and angles α, β and γ is less or equal to 1, then the predictions for given state always satisfy the inequality.

If one employs the Cauchy inequality, $|\vec{v}_1 \cdot \vec{v}_2|^2 \leq |\vec{v}_1|^2 |\vec{v}_2|^2$, one can formulate a concise ***sufficient*** condition on a state to satisfy (28). The state cannot violate the inequality if

$$T_{111}^2 + T_{222}^2 + T_{A12}^2 + T_{2B1}^2 + T_{12C}^2 \leq 1 \tag{44}$$

holds in all local bases and for all $\vec{A}_0, \vec{B}_0, \vec{C}_0$. Finally, we utilize the fact that $\max_{|\vec{A}_0|=1} T_{A12}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 T_{i12}^2$ (this is because the optimal vector is $\vec{A}_0^{opt} = (T_{112}, T_{212}, T_{312})/\sqrt{T_{112}^2 + T_{212}^2 + T_{312}^2}$), etc., and obtain the following form:

$$T_{111}^2 + T_{222}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} (T_{i12}^2 + T_{2i1}^2 + T_{12i}^2) \leq 1. \tag{45}$$

Let us derive a similar condition for (34). In the fashion of (43) the inequality reads

$$\begin{aligned} &|\hat{T} \odot (\cos\alpha \vec{e}_1 \otimes \vec{B}_0 \otimes \vec{C}_0 \\ &+ \sin\alpha \vec{e}_2 \otimes (\cos\beta\cos\gamma \vec{e}_1 \otimes \vec{e}_1 + \cos\beta\sin\gamma \vec{e}_1 \otimes \vec{e}_2 \\ &+ \sin\beta\cos\gamma \vec{e}_2 \otimes \vec{e}_1 - \sin\beta\sin\gamma \vec{e}_2 \otimes \vec{e}_2)| \qquad \leq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

(we have renumbered observables of Alice). Now, repeating the above argument, we get a necessary and sufficient condition on a state to satisfy (34). Namely in all local coordinate systems and for all $\vec{B}_0$ and $\vec{C}_0$ we shall have

$$T_{1BC}^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} T_{2ij}^2 \leq 1, \tag{47}$$

or using the trick presented earlier

$$\sum_{k=1}^{3} T_{1kC}^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} T_{2ij}^2 \leq 1. \tag{48}$$

CONCLUSIONS

A method to derive explicit Bell inequalities with more then two observables per site was proposed and demonstrated for the case of three particles and up to three observables per site. New tight Bell inequalities for correlation functions and the respective conditions to satisfy then are found. In particular, we present an inequality, (28), in which all three observers perform three alternative measurements. Interestingly, the inequalities (30), (32), (34) can be shown to be implied by both the ones found in [17, 18] and (28).

The method presented here can be generalized to $M > 3$ settings Bell inequalities, and more than three parties. This definitely would lead to narrowing the class of states which allow a local realistic model. An old result of one of us [19], which shows a drastic constraint on such a class if the number of settings goes to infinity (for 4 parties or more), clearly supports this conjecture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is part of EU 6FP programmes QAP and SCALA. M. Żukowski was supported by Wenner-Gren Foundations. M. Wieśniak is supported by FNP stipends (START programme and within Professorial Subsidy 14/2003 for MZ). In the early stage of this work was MW was supported by a UG grant BW 5400-5-0260-4 and MZ by MNiI grant 1 P03B 04927.

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 777 (1935).
[2] N. Bohr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 696 (1935).
[3] J. S. Bell, Physics, Long island City, N. Y., **1**, 195 (1964).
[4] J. Clauser, M. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
[5] N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1838 (1990).
[6] H. Weinfurter and M. Żukowski, Phys. Rev. A. **64**, 010102 (2001); R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A. **64**, 032112 (2001).
[7] M. Żukowski and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 210401 (2001).
[8] A. Sen, U. Sen, and M. Żukowski, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 032309 (2003).
[9] Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski, J.-W. Pan, and A. Zeilinger, Phys Rev. Lett. **92**,
[10] I. Pitowsky, Lect. Notes. Phys. **321** (1989).
[11] B. Tsirelson, Hadr. Jour. Suppl. **8:4** 329 (1993)
[12] I. Pitowsky and K. Svozil, Phys. Rev. A 64, 014102 (2001).
[13] C. Śliwa, Phys. Lett. A **317**, 168 (2003).
[14] M. Żukowski, quant-ph/0611086; see also M. Żukowski, Quant. Inf. Proc. **5**, 287 (2006) and P. Badziąg, M. Żukowski arXiv:0704.1809.
[15] A. Garg, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 785 (1983).
[16] A.V. Belinskii and D.N. Klyshko, *Phys. Usp.* **36**, 653 (1993).
[17] Wu, L.-A., Zong H.-S., *Phys. Lett. A* **307**, 262 (2003).
[18] W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, M. Żukowski, Č.Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230403 (2004).
[19] M. Żukowski, Phys. Lett. A **177**, 290 (1993).
[20] Please note, that Δ_0 itself generates an inequality of the CHSH-type.
[21] The original Bell inequality cannot be derived without assuming perfect (anti-)correlations. Since every experiment involves some imperfections, experimental data never agree with this assumption.